SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA

Lower Level – Room 41, City Hall/Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard August 26, 2010

Present: Robert Ferguson, Jennifer Haskamp, Pat Igo, Rich Laffin, John Manning, Matt Mazanec,

David Riehle, Mark Thomas, Steve Trimble, Diane Trout-Oertel,

Absent: Lee Meyer (not excused)

Staff Present: Christine Boulware, Amy Spong, Joey Larson

PUBLIC HEARING

CALL TO ORDER: 5:05 PM by John Manning (Chair)

- I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA Trimble, Trout-Oertel 10-0.
- II. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST None
- III. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS None

IV. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **A. 340 Summit Avenue** the work that was completed at the property that did not comply with the HPC decision was heard by the Legislative Hearing Officer. Both staff and the building inspector were present at the hearing and will be working with the applicant as issues are addressed and conditions are met.
- **B.** The Public Safety Building/Penfield proposal has been altered and still includes the loss of the historic building. The adverse effects are the same. SHPO sent a letter recommending the Golden Rule for local designation study rather than the Smyth Building. Staff is unsure as to why this decision was made. Two of the three constraints on the first design have gone away. Historic Saint Paul and the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota are signatories on the MOA. The Preservation Alliance will raise the question with SHPO about limitations to allow the Public Safety Building to be preserved. Council Member Thune called Commissioner Igo to discuss the benefits of the proposal. The Heritage Preservation Commission is not in support of facadecotomies. Just preserving the façade is not preservation. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked why they were not invited to the second presentation. The HPC did not sign the MOA.

V. PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING

A. 2242 University Avenue, University-Raymond Commercial Historic District, by Jaeger Construction LLC, for a wrecking permit to demolish the boiler room and partial loading dock to expand the parking lot. File #10-035 (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff read the report recommending the item be laid over in order for the applicant to provide/complete the following items:

- 1) A structural engineering report with estimated costs for rehabilitation, stabilization or mothballing to be completed by the applicant,
- 2) A meeting between CCPO staff, PED staff and the owner to explore other parking options that do not result in the loss of historic structures,
- 3) A statement from the owner on any known changes to the structure over time, and
- **4**) A statement from the owner with an opinion of what economic benefits might result from adding six parking spaces versus keeping the structure and restriping.

Ken Potts, Jaeger Construction, was present to discuss the proposal and stated the information requested could be obtained and supplied to the commission.

Igo motioned that the proposal be laid over in order to obtain more information. Riehle seconded the motion. The motion passed 10-0.

B. 771-775 Raymond Avenue, University-Raymond Commercial Historic District, by Kiehm Construction, for a building permit to remove and reinstall brick storefronts and replace the windows and doors. File #10-036 (Boulware, 266-6715)

Staff read the report recommending denial of the proposal to deconstruct the storefront but recommending approval of the proposal to install new windows and door systems with conditions. Trout-Oertel asked about the window condition. Riehle asked about the proposal to deconstruct the storefront. Staff explained it is not common to completely reconstruct the storefront. Trout-Oertel and Ferguson asked about the window material and finish.

Marty Kiehm of Kiehm Construction and Pat Jordan, owner, was present to discuss the application. Kiehm explained there are water issues at the front wall and he would rather not remove the whole wall due to the cost, but the ties have failed. An engineer has looked at the storefront and it is pulling away from the structure. The leaking in the building is due to the shift in the bricks. Kiehm presented photos that show the movement of the storefront and stated the storefront cannot be restored evenly without reconstruction. The brick would be reused and the patter would be replicated. The windows would require replacement. Riehle asked if there was a danger of collapse. Kiehm replied there was not. Staff asked for a percentage of expected breakage and source for matching brick. Kiehm replied there is not a match, but a close match to all details but not the glazed texture. Manning asked how new brick could be integrated into the storefront. Kiehm replied that new brick would be used under the awnings. Staff replied the awnings do not comply with the guidelines and they cannot be reinstalled in the same location. Igo stated the work would be time and labor intensive and asked how many brick could be salvaged. Kiehm replied more than 80%. Igo asked if he would work with staff on the windows and awnings. Kiehm replied he was open to suggestions. Igo asked if he could get a letter from a structural engineer. Kiehm replied he could, but it would be another expense. Ferguson asked if he were experienced with historic masonry. Laffin stated the ties were probably never galvanized or plated and reconstruction would probably be necessary. He added that it should be shown where new brick will be "feathered" back in with the existing. Laffin stated the storefront should be reconstructed to match exactly. Kiehm replied they will only reconstruct down to the water table. Manning stated this restoration is a big deal. Pat Jordan stated she didn't know about the damages to the wall when she purchased the building. She added that they plan to restore the front to how it has looked for "years and years." She added that she would like to reinstall the existing awnings and she feels that they are being punished financially if they can't reinstall them.

Igo motioned to approve the deconstruction and reconstruction of the storefronts and staff recommendations 1-4. He added he would like to see the structural engineer report submitted. Staff added that the engineer in DSI will need to have more information regarding the reconstruction of the store front. Riehle seconded the motion. Trimble added a friendly amendment that the applicant shall work with staff on adding new brick. He also suggested they explore the availability of glazed brick. Laffin suggesting exploring the availability of brick at remote brickyards and added that cost of new awnings is a sliver of the expense of reconstructing the storefronts. Ferguson added the friendly amendment that the storefronts shall be documented to HABS standards to help with the reconstruction and that partial measured drawings would be acceptable. Trout-Oertel commended the owner for restoring the façade and added that she appreciates the expense involved. She stated replacement of the awnings appropriately is the final step. Manning stated this is a good contribution to the district. The motion passed 9-0.

C. 779 E. Sixth Street, Dayton's Bluff Historic District, by Minnesota Housing Construction, for an After-the-Fact building permit to remove old windows and alter the front porch. File #10-037 (Boulware, 266-6715)

Staff read the report recommending denial of the application and correction of work that was completed without HPC review or a permit. The applicant was not present to discuss the proposal. Igo asked if the aluminum siding had been painted. Riehle asked if there had been a permit for work at the property. Staff replied a permit had been issued for interior work only. Riehle asked if it were

a single-family house. Staff replied that the property is a duplex. Manning stated the applicant was not present and asked if staff had received any correspondence. Staff indicated they had not. **Riehle motioned to deny the application with staff recommendations. Mazanec seconded the motion.** Igo stated that this is not good for the Dayton's Bluff Historic District. Ferguson stated he had driven by the property and the building has been "defaced." Trimble supplied some historical information about the development of the block and Ms. Keller. Ferguson noted a grammatical edit for the conditions. Mazanec asked about enforcement of the HPC decision. Staff responded the applicant shall have a time period in which to perform corrections and if the corrections are not made staff will consult with the City Attorney's office about legal action. **The motion passed 9-0.**

D. 255 E. Kellogg Boulevard, Lowertown Historic District, by Cermak Rhoades Architects, for a building permit to replace all windows on the 3rd, 4th and 5th floors. File #10-038 (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff read the report recommending conditional approval. Staff stated there is a covenant on the building and that proposals need to be reviewed by SHPO. Staff received a letter from SHPO regarding the proposal requiring that no glass be installed in front of the prism glass, that the muntins are full-divided-lites, they commented on the screen detail and low-E coating on the glass. Chris Wegschied, Cermak Rhoades Architects, was present to discuss the proposal and answer questions. He addressed the three issued raised by staff and SHPO about prism glass, the muntin details and screen windows. He explained that the 4"by4" prism glass is not weather-tight and a deeper sash would be needed to accommodate glass in the frame. There would be heat and moisture issues if the prism glass were to have an interior storm. The muntin detail is not matching because the glass thickens on the non-primary elevations is thicker, but the sash are set at their historic depth which alters the site-lines. The screens are desired for quality-of-life reasons. Staff and Wegschied have both discussed the project with SHPO, but haven't received a final decision yet. There was discussion about retro-fitting the prism glass with a removable panel or installing aluminum-clad sash on the front in order to address thermal/moisture issued. Maria Gamble, building resident, explained her understanding of the SHPO covenant and discussed issues with the windows, past replacement and the desire to have screens. She indicated that proximity to the river meant there are insects and the building does not have air conditioning, so the windows are open for ventilation. Igo motioned to approve the application with staff recommendations and include SHPO recommendations and the applicant shall work with SHPO and HPC to resolve issues. Trimble seconded the motion. Laffin stated that the applicant addressed #1 & #2 and they should be struck. He agrees with the full-height, aluminum screens. Trout-Oertel stated the project can't proceed without further discussion and would vote no. Riehle discussed technical issues, the buildings history and its significance to labor history as leatherwork was a major industry in Saint Paul. Haskamp asked if interior screens would be possible on the minor elevations. The motion was not approved 1-6(Ferguson, Haskamp, Laffin, Manning, Mazanec, Thomas, Trout-Oertel) -2 (Trimble, Riehle).

Laffin asked staff about how to address SHPO issues of prisms glass, muntins, screens and low-e coating. Manning replied the applicant will pursue those issues with SHPO and the HPC will review based on the Lowertown design review guidelines. Staff stated the applicant can meet with SHPO and come back if it is necessary. Trout-Oertel asked if the item should be laid over. Staff indicated the applicant would still need direction. Beth Pfeiffer, Cornerstone Group, described the covenant (one page document) and explained that HPC and SHPO both must approve the project and asked for specific direction from the HPC to have a dialog with SHPO.

Laffin motioned to approve the application with the following conditions:

- 1. As proposed, windows on the south (primary) façade shall be wood and for the remaining (secondary) facades, aluminum with a dark finish is acceptable.
- 2. All windows may have double-insulated glass as proposed.
- 3. The Low-E coating shall be the least reflective coating (this is consistent with SHPO's comment).

- 4. If screens are desired, they shall be interior only.
- 5. The muntins shall match the pattern of original windows and shall have fully simulated divided lights (this is consistent with SHPO's comment).
- 6. The prism glass on the main elevation may be reinstalled behind the new insulated glass. If a technologically feasible alternative arises to have the prism glass installed on the exterior side of the glass while adding insulating qualities to the sash and without causing further deterioration of the prism glass assembly, then staff shall review such a proposal. (This is not consistent with SHPO's comment; however, the HPC heard testimony from the architect which explained the technological challenges of installing the prism glass on the exterior.)

Igo seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **A.** 3M Committee update (Trimble, Mazanec) None
- **B.** Public Safety Building update (Manning, Igo) See Staff Announcement

VIII. ADJOURN: 7:38

Submitted by: C. Boulware